

***AE1-11: The Study and Design of a Project Titled “Architect-Engineering Services for the George C. Marshall Space Flight Center Alabama and Support Facilities”***

***ARCHITECT/ENGINEER PAST PERFORMANCE REPORT***

***In compliance with the direction in the FAR, the information contained in this evaluation is not subject to view by anyone other than the designated source selection evaluation personnel.***

***INSTRUCTIONS, DEFINITIONS, AND RATING GUIDELINES***

*Instructions*

This evaluation is to be completed as indicated below. Provide one evaluation for each of the projects listed as “Example Projects” in Section F of the completed Standard Form 330. For purposes of these evaluations, the term “contract” is intended to mean “project”. This package consists of the following:

<b><u>Section</u></b>	<b><u>Description</u></b>	<b><u>Who completes</u></b>
Section I	Basic contract information	Architect/Engineer (A/E) being evaluated
Section II	Evaluator identification information	Client's Evaluator
Section III	Contractor Performance Report	Client's Evaluator

**Clients shall submit Past Performance Reports on or before Proposal due date.**

Any questions may be directed to NASA representative, Mr. Robert T. Mathis at (256) 544-7921.

## ***ARCHITECT/ENGINEER PAST PERFORMANCE REPORT***

### ***Section I***

**To be completed by A/E requesting evaluation.**

Contract Number:	
Contract Title:	
A/E's Company Name:	
Contract Award Date:	
Contract Completion Date (including options):	

### ***Section II***

**To be completed by Client's Evaluator.**

Evaluator's Company/Agency Name:	
Evaluator's Name (Typed):	
Evaluator's Signature:	
Phone Number:	
Facsimile Number:	
E-mail address:	
Date:	

## **ARCHITECT/ENGINEER PAST PERFORMANCE REPORT**

### **Section III**

#### **Definitions and Rating Guidelines**

The Factors/Ratings tables on the next page summarize the Architect/Engineer's past performance in each of the following rating areas. Each criterion should be assigned a rating, from highest to lowest, of Excellent Plus, Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor, or Unsatisfactory. If a particular criterion is not applicable, it should be rated in the far right column as N/A. However, the evaluator is encouraged to provide comments on any rating to further support a particular rating.

The following definitions and instructions should be used as guidance to aid in evaluating the criteria in the Factors/Ratings tables. Please read the definitions and instructions before rating any criteria to be sure that each criterion is graded in the context of the definitions.

<b>Technical Performance</b>	<b>Cost Control</b>	<b>Timeliness of Performance</b>	<b>Management Effectiveness</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Compliance with contract requirement</li><li>- Appropriateness of personnel</li><li>- Technical excellence</li><li>- Responsive to technical direction</li><li>- Effectiveness of recommended solutions</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Within budget (over/under target costs)</li><li>- Current, accurate, and complete cost reporting</li><li>- Cost efficiencies</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Met interim schedule milestones</li><li>- Requirement of contract was delivered on time</li><li>- Contract administrative activities performed timely</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Reliable</li><li>- Pro-active</li><li>- Reasonable and cooperative</li><li>- Flexible</li><li>- Prompt notification of problems</li><li>- Effective management of subcontractors</li><li>- Accuracy of reports</li><li>- Communicated well throughout the contract</li></ul>

The four headings above relate to the actual ratings defined on the following pages.

**ARCHITECT/ENGINEER PAST PERFORMANCE REPORT**

## Section III (Cont'd)

<b>Technical Performance</b>	<b>Cost Control</b>	<b>Timeliness of Performance</b>	<b>Management Effectiveness</b>
<b><i>Excellent Plus</i></b>			
The A/E has demonstrated an exceptional performance level in any of the below categories that justified additional consideration. This rating will be used only in those circumstances when A/E performance clearly exceeded the Excellent performance level.			
<b><i>Excellent</i></b>			
There were no quality problems.	There were no cost issues.	There were no delays.	Responses to inquiries, technical, service, and administrative issues were effective and responsive.
<b><i>Good</i></b>			
Non-conformances or technical issues did not impact achievement of contract requirements.	Cost issues did not impact achievement of contract requirements.	Delays did not impact achievement of contract requirements.	Response to inquiries, technical, service, and administrative issues were usually effective and responsive.
<b><i>Fair</i></b>			
Non-conformances or technical issues required minor Client resources to ensure achievement of contract requirements.	Cost issues required minor Client resources to ensure achievement of contract requirements.	Delays required minor Client resources to ensure achievement of contract requirements.	Response to inquiries, technical, service, and administrative issues were somewhat effective and responsive.
<b><i>Poor</i></b>			
Non-conformances or technical issues required major Client resources to ensure achievement of contract requirements.	Cost issues required major Client resources to ensure achievement of contract requirements.	Delays required major Client resources to ensure achievement of contract requirements.	Response to inquiries, technical, service, and administrative issues were marginally effective and responsive.
<b><i>Unsatisfactory</i></b>			
Non-conformances or technical issues compromised the achievement of contract requirements, despite use of Client's resources.	Cost issues compromised performance of contract requirements.	Delays compromised the achievement of contract requirements, despite the use of Client's resources.	Response to inquiries, technical, service, and administrative issues were not effective and not responsive.

## ARCHITECT/ENGINEER PAST PERFORMANCE REPORT

### Section III (Cont'd)

Item	FACTORS/RATINGS	Excellent Plus	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Unsatisfactory	Not Applicable
<b><i>Technical Performance</i></b>								
1	Overall skill level & technical competence of A/E's personnel?							
2	Ability to identify risk factors and alternatives for alleviating risk?							
3	Ability to identify and solve problems expeditiously?							
<b><i>Cost Control</i></b>								
4	Ability to accurately control contract cost (if the contract experienced an overrun, please amplify on the following page)?							
5	Did the A/E diligently search for and apply cost efficient practices?							
6	Were A/E's cost estimates accurate and complete?							
<b><i>Timeliness of Performance</i></b>								
7	Completion of major tasks or key project milestones on schedule?							
8	Did the A/E deliver end items per the contract schedule?							
9	Were the A/E's reports and documentation submitted timely?							
<b><i>Management Effectiveness</i></b>								
10	Was the A/E able to effectively coordinate, integrate & manage subcontractors?							
11	Did the A/E management team show innovation and a proactive approach to problem identification and resolution?							
12	Was the A/E effective in interfacing with the Client's staff?							
13	Was the documentation produced by the A/E satisfactory?							
14	A/E's responsiveness to Client's changes?							
15	To what extent did the A/E display initiative in meeting requirements?							
16	Did the A/E effectively communicate pertinent issues throughout the contract?							
<b><i>Overall Evaluation</i></b>								
17	How would you rate the A/E's <u>overall management performance</u> on this contract?							
18	How would you rate the A/E's <u>overall technical performance</u> on this contract?							
19	Would you use this A/E again? (If "No", please comment in the Narrative Summary)	<b>Yes</b>					<b>No</b>	

## ARCHITECT/ENGINEER PAST PERFORMANCE REPORT

## Section III (Cont'd)

**NARRATIVE SUMMARY (Use this section to explain additional information not included above)**

[illegible]

## PAST PERFORMANCE FORM LETTER EXAMPLE

*Synopsis Name & RFP Number*

### **CLIENT AUTHORIZATION LETTER: FORMAT**

*[Date of Letter]*

*[Name and Address of A/E's Client]*

Attention: *[Name and Designation of Client's Evaluator]*

Dear *[Contact Name]*:

We are currently responding to the NASA, Marshall Space Flight Center Request for Proposal (RFP) (*insert number and title of RFP*). NASA is requesting that clients of entities responding to the synopsis participate in the evaluation process. We have included our project for your company/agency as a past performance reference. An Architect/Engineer Past Performance Report is enclosed. Please complete Sections II and III of the enclosed evaluation and return the signed, completed document to:

NASA

Attention: AS22/Robert T. Mathis

Marshall Space Center, Alabama 35812

In order to maintain the integrity of this process, **DO NOT** return the Report to us. Return it to the address listed above.

The completed Report must be received by NASA on or before the Proposal due date (*insert due date noted in the RFP*).

Please direct any questions to Mr. Mathis at (256 544-7921).

Sincerely,

*[Name of Signer]*

*[Designation of Signer]*